

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 7. Applicant has corrected the word “auhtenticate” to “authenticate” in step 714 and believes that this correction is now in compliance with the requirement of 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d).

Attachments: Replacement Sheet

Annotated Sheet Showing Change

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Formal Matters

1. The following remarks address the objections and rejections contained in the Office Action mailed November 17, 2004. A Request for two months extension of time is concurrently filed with this Amendment.

2. The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d). Applicant has corrected the typographical error on Figure 7 and submits herewith a replacement sheet of Figure 7. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn from the drawings.

3. The specification stands objected to as containing typographical errors. Applicant has made the appropriate amendments to the specification as shown above and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection from the specification.

4. Claims 4, 10, 12, 18, 22, 24, 32, 50-52, 62, and 63 are objected to as containing informalities. Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner. No new matter has been added. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

Art Rejections

1. Claims 1-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Elliott et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,335,927 ("Elliott"). Claims 1, 10, 24, 30, 50 and 58 are all independent claims. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

To be an "anticipation" rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every element and recitation of the Applicants' claims. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art. Thus, the reference must clearly and unequivocally disclose every element and recitation of the claimed invention.

Independent Claims 1 and 30

Applicant submits that Elliott fails to disclose at least the following recitations of independent claims 1 and 30:

“a plurality of domains each having a plurality of domain based media switches, each of the plurality of media switches configured to route messages associated with the collaborative communication session between the plurality of endpoints.”

Elliott is directed to a system for providing requested quality of service in a hybrid network (*See e.g. Title*). More specifically, Elliott describes the marriage of the Internet with telephony systems realized by routing information across the Internet utilizing telephony routing information and internet protocol address information (*See Col. 1, lines 24-30*). User information associated with a telephony order entry procedure is captured and used throughout the system for billing, monitoring, reporting and other control functions thereby allowing the telephone operator to maintain quality of service and routing selection (*See Col. 1, lines 30-39*).

The Examiner appears to equate Figure 19c of Elliott with the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The H.323 video-conferencing architecture illustrated in Figure 19c is completely different from the collaborative communication system architecture of the claimed subject matter. Specifically, Figure 19c does not show the claimed plurality of domains each having a plurality of domain based media switches. Rather, the switch network in Figure 19c is a centrally located group of switches associated with a single network provider MCI.

Because the network architecture of Figure 19c does not locate media switches within each domain, the architecture is unable to offer at least some of the advantages realized by the claimed subject matter, including but not limited to offering flexibility in the location of components while not being limited to a single media type. Figure 19c and its respective description does not illustrate or describe the claimed plurality of domains each having a plurality of domain based media switches. Therefore, the Elliott reference cannot anticipate independent claims 1 and 30 or the claims that depend therefrom.

Independent Claim 10

Applicant submits that Elliott fails to disclose at least the following recitations of independent claim 10:

“a client domain comprising a client media switch, a distributed collaborative communication service, and a plurality of endpoints configured to engage in a collaborative communication session using the plurality of collaborative communication services and the distributed collaborative communication service.

Elliott fails to anticipate independent claim 10 for at least the reasons set forth above which are fully incorporated herein. Namely, the Examiner points to the switch network displayed in Figure 19c as being equivalent to the claimed media switch. As stated above, switch network in Figure 19c is a centrally located group of switches associated with a single network provider MCI. The switches displayed in Figure 19c are not part of a domain or even a client domain as clearly recited in independent claim 10. Moreover, the Examiner points to the plurality of terminals 1, 8, 9 and 10 as being equivalent to the claimed plurality of endpoints, however, the Examiner fails to show where a client domain comprising a client media switch is shown in Figure 19c or described in the Elliott reference. Because the Elliott reference describes an architecture different from that claimed and because the Elliott reference does not disclose a client domain comprising a client media switch, the Elliott reference cannot and does not anticipate independent claim 10 or the claims that depend therefrom.

Independent Claim 24

Applicant submits that Elliott fails to disclose at least the following recitations of independent claim 24:

“a media switch service configured to enable the media switch to act as an addressable endpoint.”

The Examiner appears to equate the claimed media switch capable of acting as an addressable endpoint with the H.323 server described in Elliott. As described in Col. 124, lines 19-23, the H.323 server provides a variety of services including call control, multipoint control, multipoint processing and gateway services. However, there is no indication in Elliott that the switch network, acting either alone or in conjunction with the H.323 server, has the capability of

acting as an addressable endpoint. Because Elliott fails to disclose this limitation, Elliott cannot and does not anticipate independent claim 24 or the claims that depend therefrom.

Independent Claim 50

Applicant submits that Elliott fails to disclose at least the following recitations of independent claim 50:

“a collaborative communication system domain comprising:
a plurality of media switches, each of the plurality of media switches configured to route multi-media message generated by a plurality of endpoints to a destination endpoint;”

Claim 50 is drawn to a collaborative communication system domain having a plurality of media switches. Elliott fails to disclose the claimed subject matter for at least the reasons stated above regarding independent claims 1 and 30, those argument being incorporated fully herein. Specifically, Elliott does not disclose a communication domain having a plurality of media switched. As such, Elliott cannot anticipate independent claim 50 or the claims that depend therefrom.

Independent Claim 58

Applicant submits that Elliott fails to disclose at least the following recitations of independent claim 58:

“receiving locate and reserve messages from an endpoint attempting to locate and reserve a collaborative communication service;”

The Examiner points to the video call initiation description in Col. 125, lines 61-67 as describing the locate and reserve message. Applicant respectfully disagree and argues that the initiation description in Elliott only discloses receiving a locate message from an endpoint and does not disclose reserving a service. Elliott clearly describes selecting a destination terminal for initiating a video conference. If the terminal is available the call is established. However, if the terminal is unavailable the calling terminal may opt to deposit the video for later retrieval. (See Col. 126, lines 1-8) Elliott therefore describes a locate and store message sequence. Elliott does

not describe locating and reserving an available collaborative communication service. Because Elliott fails to disclose each limitation of the claimed subject matter, Elliott cannot anticipate independent claim 58 or the claims that depend therefrom.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Elliott fails to anticipate independent claims 1, 10, 24, 30, 50, 58 and the claims that depend therefrom. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the 102(b) rejection from these claims.

CONCLUSION

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-63 are pending. Based on the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that the claims are in condition for allowance and such is respectfully requested. Applicants assert that no new matter has been introduced as a result of these amendments.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees required by this response to our Deposit Account No. **50-2613** (Order No. 45098.00010.P1068.UTL).

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 4/18/05

By: Amy E. Simpson
Amy E. Simpson
Reg. No. 54,688

PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP
P.O. Box 92191
San Diego, CA 92191-9092
PH: (858) 720-2500
FX: (858) 720-2555
Customer No. 36183